

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above referenced application is respectfully requested in view of the following amendments to the specification, claims and requested drawing changes.

In the Office Action dated December 21, 2005, the Examiner indicated that the IDS filed on 9/6/05 failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2). Applicants submit herewith, another IDS which includes a legible copy of the document listed thereon.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4). Applicants have attempted to obviate these objections by making amendments to the specification, claims and/or proposed changes to the drawings. Once approved by the Examiner, formal drawings incorporating the proposed changes will be filed.

The Examiner objected to the presentation of the Abstract and Specification. Applicants have amended both the Abstract and the Specification to address the issues raised by the Examiner.

The Examiner entered a requirement under 35 USC 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits. Applicants elect to prosecute Claims 1,5,6,7,8,9,10 through 20 which are directed to the species shown in Fig. 3. Claims 2-4 have been cancelled herein but Applicants reserve their right to prosecute these claims in a subsequent application.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael E. Marion, Reg.32,266  
Attorney  
(914) 333-9641